IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 5679 of 2003

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

NILESH @ NILU GOVINDBHAI CHAUHAN

Versus

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 5679 of 2003

MR NM KAPADIA for Petitioner No. 1

MR RC KODEKAR, AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

Date of decision: 30/07/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

By means of filing this petition, the petitioner has challenged the order of detention dated 22-3-2003 passed by the Police Commissiioner, Surat City, and he

has been branded as a dangerous person.

2. It is a settled principle of law that in order to bring a person within the expression "dangerous person" as defined in clause (c) of section 2 of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (for short `the Act of 1985'), there should be positive materials to indicate that such person is habitual of committing or attempting to commit or abetting the commission of offences which are punishable under Chapter XVI or XVII of Chapter V of the Arms Act and that single or isolated act falling under the said Chapters cannot be characterised as a habitual acts as envisaged in section 2(c) of the PASA Act. Further, besides a person being a dangerous person, his activities should also fall within the ambit of expression `public order'. A distinction has to be drawn between the `law and order' and `maintenance of public order'. A reference may be made of M.J.Shaikh V. M.M. Mehta, Commissioner of Police & Ors., reported in 1995 (2) GLR 1268.

3. Heard learned advocate for the petitioner and the learned AGP for the State. Also perused the record. Learned advocate for the petitioner has mainly concentrated his argument on the point that detenu was in judicial custody when the detention order was passed. In this regard, he has drawn my attention towards page 24, Annexure-B of the petition and contented that when the order of detention was passed, the detenu was in judicial custody which aspect ought to have been considered by the authority while passing the detention order and, therefore, there is non-application of mind on the part of the detaining authority and, hence, continued detention is illegal. He has drawn my attention towards the case of Amritlal and Others Vs. Union Govt. Through Secy., Ministry of Finance and Others, 2001 SCC (Cri) 147 wherein it was held at Head note as under:

> "Preventive Detention--Detention order-Subjective satisfaction--Detenu already in jail-Detaining authority must be satisfied on the basis of available cogent material about likelihood of the detenu being released on bail and not merely about likelihood of his moving application for bail--In absence of such satisfaction detention order cannot be sustained--Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic drugs and Psychotropic Substances act, 1988, S.3(1)"

4. It seems that there is non-application of mind on the part of detaining authority as the detenu was in

judicial custody when the order of detention was passed hence, in view of the judgment rendered in Amritlal (supra), the continued detention of the detenu is illegal and the same cannot be sustained.

5. The petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 22-3-2003 passed against the detenu is hereby quashed and set aside. The detenu is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly. Direct service is permitted.

(R.P.DHOLAKIA,J.)

radhan/